

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 10, 2018
Pre-meeting – 6:00 p.m. – Regular Session – 7:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Lynette Wendel, Chair
John Warnas, Vice Chair
Anna Barbieri
Kent Burggraaf
Richard Morley - Excused
Don Quigley
Justin Peterson (Alternate)


Community Development Staff


Mark McGrath – Director/Community Development
Angela Price – Associate – Principal Planner
Amanda Roman – City Planner
Stephanie Shelman – Deputy City Attorney
Jean Gallegos – Admin Asst/Recorder

PUBLIC: Meredith Harker, Michael Brodsky, Zachary Brodsky, Kade Perez

WELCOME: Commissioner Wendel assumed duties as Chair, welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

WORK MEETING

1. The briefing session to review the agenda was conducted by **Mark McGrath** at 6:00 p.m. Staff reviewed two text amendments (one on Site Specific Development Districts and the other on Muirhouse (SSD-R Muirhouse) and a change to the Taylorsville Land Development Code which involved setback requirements for a 7-Eleven being considered. Also discussed was a general plan amendment from Professional Office to High Density for a specific site and one zoning map amendment for the same site from Hospital (H) to Site Specific Development – Residential. Commissioners expressed many concerns about the proposed changes in setback requirements and intrusion with in place rights-of-way for one site which may have unintended consequences for other sites throughout the City. Also discussed during the briefing session was the Strategic Planning Sessions and changes in the City Council meeting representation schedule.  6:36 PM

2. Review/Approval of Minutes for March 13, 2018.  **7:00 PM**

CONSENT AGENDA


MOTION: **Commissioner Quigley** - I will move for approval of the Consent Agenda consisting of the Minutes for March 13, 2018.

SECOND: **Commissioner Burggraaf**

VOTE: No official vote was taken. Minutes are considered approved.


TEXT AMENDMENTS

3. 2218 - Recommendation to the City Council for a Text Amendment to the Taylorsville Land Development Code, Sections 13.07.020(B) (Note 7), 13.23.030(D) and 13.23.220(D)(2). (Angela Price/Associate Planner)

 7:07 PM

- 3.1 **Ms. Price** presented this item saying that 7-Eleven is proposing a text amendment to the Limited Commercial (LC) zone side and rear abut residential setbacks for reduction in size. The applicant is interested in developing an “auto self-service station” at 2724 West 5400 South. There are several site constraints that are impeding development, including the residential setback requirements for the side and rear of the property, hence the setback reduction request. This application provided a catalyst for the Community Development Department to review building locations, setbacks and measurement parameters for the commercial districts. Staff is recommending additional text amendments to reflect a revised mechanism for measuring setbacks along with changes to provide clarity and consistency on building locations



and setbacks in the commercial districts. Summary: Update the method of setback measurement. Change setback requirements throughout commercial districts. Per the applicant's request reduce the side and rear abut residential setback from 30' to 20' in LC zone. Clean up footnotes to provide consistency with code updates and include a provision consistency with code updates and include a provision from the Design Standards allowing a setback reduction based on the implementation of urban design principles. She added an option from the Design Standards to call out in the setback table an option for a commercial developer. Lastly to remove language from the LC zone to allow for parking on the front and rear of the property. The proposed amendment to 13.07.020(B) Note 7 is a change in how setbacks are measured. Essentially the proposal is just changing the width being measured for the front yard setback. Normally the setback requirement throughout the commercial district is 39 feet, which measurement was taken from top back of curb. The standard sidewalk width is 4 feet, standard park strip width is 5 feet and the top back of curb is about 2 ½ feet, which comes out to roughly 11 feet. Proposed change is measured from the front of the property line or back of right of way.


 7:12 PM

3.2 **Findings:**


- 3.2.1 This application was initiated by 7-Eleven.
- 3.2.2 The applicant is interested in developing an auto self-service station at 2724 West 5400 South, in the Limited Commercial (LC) zone.
- 3.2.3 The applicant has requested a reduction in the side and rear, abut residential setbacks for the LC zone.
- 3.2.4 Staff is proposing changes to 13.07.020(B) (Note 7) to provide clarity and consistency on measuring front yard setbacks and reduce the front yard setbacks for park and ride structures from 39' to 25'.
- 3.2.5 Changes to 13.23.030(D) will clarify setback measurement parameters, update setbacks to provide consistency with the newly defined measurements and clean-up the notes. These text amendments are proposed changes per staff recommendations, which prompted review per the applicant's LC zone request.
- 3.2.6 13.23.220(D)(2) proposed changes which will remove the stipulation from the LC zone that does not allow for parking in the front of the building and remove front building non-conforming status from gas stations in the LC zone. This proposed text amendment is a recommendation from staff.
- 3.2.7 A text amendment to the Taylorsville Land Development Code must be approved or denied by the City Council.


3.3 **Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Planning Commission makes a positive recommendation to the City Council for a text amendment to the Taylorsville Land Development Code 13.07.020(B) (Note 7), 13.23.030(D) and 13.23.220(D)(2)



3.4 **Speaking: Steve Douglas** – Civil Engineer (speaking for the applicant).  7:20 PM **Mr. Douglas** said that the restriction on setback width limits the available space and doesn't quite work for 7-Eleven. However, 7-Eleven is committed to work with the City to make this project happen. **Commissioner Warnas** commented that he had noticed in his travels that 7-Eleven generally has one building and site plan. **Mr. Douglas** agreed that was correct.  7:22 PM **Commissioner Barbieri** felt that 10' feet is a big difference as far as residents are concerned and wondered if it mattered that much to 7-Eleven. **Mr. Douglas** said it absolutely mattered because it impacts the placement of the gas pumps.

 7:25 PM


3.5 **Discussion:**


3.5.1 **Commissioner Quigley** wanted to make sure it was evident he was pro-business and felt a 7-Eleven would be a great addition to this corner. The challenge is what is approved for this one applicant is approved for anyone else city-wide. The 30-foot setback is the problem and for this one scenario it makes sense to reduce that amount but for another project elsewhere it would not. He felt that a better route may be to file for a variance with the Board of Adjustment outlining the specific problems involved with this particular parcel in order to lessen the impact of unintended consequences. That he might be willing to accommodate other changes but not the 30-foot reduction to 20-foot as is being requested.  7:27 PM. His suggestion was for the applicant to look at other options to achieve their goal.

3.5.2  7:30 PM **Commissioner Warnas** said he was familiar with this particular corner and was concerned if this would impact the bicycle trail that runs through that area. **Mr. McGrath** said that would be integrated into this proposal.

3.5.3  7:31 PM **Commissioner Burggraaf** said it was his understanding that the Board of Adjustment no longer existed and **Mr. McGrath** said that was correct and had been replaced by an appeal authority before an Administrative Judge system.  7:32 PM **Commissioner Burggraaf** was supportive of Staff's recommendations relevant to this matter. He felt they presented appropriate distances and would get behind it if the Commission was supportive of the changes proposed by Commissioner Quigley but was strongly in favor of what Staff has presented in the form of changes to setbacks. He did not feel that 20' is too short of distance when abutting residential zones.

3.5.4 **Commissioner Wendel** commented that she agreed with the comments having been made so far. It is very challenging when the City wants to be welcoming of every business opportunity in the community but this is a special and unique lot. Because it is so unique it prevents her from being supportive of a City-wide change. It is not something that would be applied in many situations because not everyone has a canal running under their lot, the size dimension, the roads, etc., that are specific to this lot. She was sensitive to the fact that this is a unique situation and those are typically not how City-wide text amendment changes are made. In reference to the distance, she felt that they will be in a long-term plan talking how to make gas stations a separate zone from other designations because in talking about noise, emissions, parking in front of the building, etc., those are all quality of life issues that can't be conglomerated into one zone and one district. Gas stations certainly provide an environment that is unique. Between a unique property and a unique set of needs by 7-Eleven, there is probably a better approach available to see how else and where else in Taylorsville this could be accommodated.

3.5.5 **Commissioner Quigley** asked what the zone was on the corner where the St Marks's emergency care facility across the street to the east. **Mr. McGrath** said that was mixed use.  7:34 PM **Commissioner Quigley** thought of that particular project because he remembered spending a lot of time on placement of the parking for that facility. He noted that the parking for this new proposal for 7-Eleven contains an allowance for parking in front, which he did not have a problem with for that use. However, he wanted them to pursue a different avenue, with a site-specific situation rather than an across the board – City wide text change in the ordinance. **Commissioner Burggraaf** asked for clarification on the process Commissioner Quigley was referencing for the applicant to possibly seek a variance as opposed to a text change. **Commissioner Quigley** asked Staff if the Commission can make recommendation in the motion because this was triggered by a specific applicant but Staff saw a window of opportunity to clean up the text in general. His question was what was going to be forwarded to the City Council – did they need to separate this and have Staff come back with the text changes with the other various clean-ups or was the Commission here tonight to just make a recommendation on the specific applicant's request. **Mr. McGrath** suggested that was no need to bring it back. If the Commission simply gives Staff direction regarding the two places contained therein that were not being supported. If the Commission wants to specifically reference those two places, everything else can be carried to the City Council. This will go to the City Council regardless – part may have a negative recommendation and most of it will have a positive recommendation. He suggested clearly articulating in the motion the portion having a positive recommendation and which was a negative recommendation and felt that would work.

3.6 **MOTION:**  7:37 PM **Commissioner Quigley** – I would recommend that the Planning Commission sends a positive recommendation to the City Council for the text change amendment to the Taylorsville Land Development Code 13.07.020(B) Note 7 and 13.23.030(D) and 13.23.220(D)(2) with the exception of to keep the side abut residential standard for neighborhood commercial districts and limited commercial districts to remain at 30 feet and to also have the rear abut residential district for neighborhood commercial district and limited commercial districts to likewise remain at 30 feet but that all other text changes as proposed by Staff be positively recommended to the City Council. **Commissioner Wendel** repeated the motion: A motion for a positive recommendation to the City Council for text amendment to the Taylorsville Land Development Code, Sections 13.07.020(B) Note 7, 13.23.030(D) and 13.23.220(D)(2) with the exception of the neighborhood commercial district and limited commercial district remaining in their original distances of 30 feet, 20 feet rear for neighborhood commercial and 10 feet for limited commercial district retrospectively.

SECOND: Commissioner Warnas.

VOTE: Commissioner Peterson – AYE, Commissioner Barbieri – AYE, Commissioner Quigley – AYE, Commissioner Warnas – AYE, Commissioner Burggraaf – AYE. Commissioner Burggraaf - I would like it noted that I strongly support the original recommendation suggested by Staff. Commissioner Quigley – I hope we can make this work for you (to applicant). I would love to see you come to town and would love to see a 7-Eleven on that corner and I hope that you don't take this as a negative response. I just think there is a different route that you need to take it in.

4. 3Z18 – Recommendation to the City Council for a Text Amendment to the Taylorsville Land Development Code concerning Chapter 13.19, Site Specific Development Districts. (Mark McGrath-Director of Community Development)



7:41 PM

4.1 **Mr. McGrath** presented this item. Chapter 13.19 Site Specific Development Districts (SSD) is utilized to establish development standards specific to a certain location within the City. Like all zoning district regulations, the SSD articulates development regulations such as land use, building heights, setbacks, etc. However, rather than being city-wide the regulations are tied to a specific location. Currently the only SSD district in Taylorsville is the SSD-X Bennion Point that was adopted to facilitate the Summit Vista Retirement Community.

4.1.1 The current SSD chapter allows site specific development for: Research and development, professional office, industrial, commercial, and mixed use. It does not recognize residential land use.

4.1.2 At the January 17, 2018 City Council meeting, the Taylorsville City Council directed Staff to develop an SSD zoning regulation to facilitate the Muirhouse multi-family residential development project located at 3845 West 4700 South to ensure that the future development would conform to the project as proposed by Hamlet Homes.

4.2 **Findings:**

4.2.1 The current Taylorsville Land Development Code, Chapter 13.19, Site Specific Development (SSD) Districts recognizes the following land uses:

4.2.1.1 Research and development (SSD-RD)

4.2.1.2 Professional Office (SSD-PO)

4.2.1.3 Industrial (SSD-I)

4.2.1.4 Commercial (SSD-C)

4.2.1.5 Mixed Use (SSD-X)

4.2.2 The current Taylorsville Land Development Code, Chapter 13.19, Site Specific Development (SSD) Districts does not recognize residential uses.

4.2.3 In order to facilitate the Muirhouse site specific development, and future residential site specific residential projects, the current code must be amended to recognize *residential* development.

4.3 **Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the proposed change. Staff felt like this was a good process that would be used extensively in the future.


4.4 **Speaking:** **Commissioner Wendel** opened the public hearing and inasmuch as no one came forward, closed the public hearing. She then opened the item for discussion or a motion by the Commission.

4.5 **MOTION:** [Commissioner Barbieri - I will make a recommendation for approval for File #3Z18 as presented](#)

[by Staff.](#)  7:44 PM

SECOND: [Commissioner Quigley.](#)

VOTE: [Commissioner Peterson – AYE, Commissioner Barbieri – AYE, Commissioner Quigley – AYE, Commissioner Warnas – AYE, Commissioner Burggraaf – AYE.](#)


5. 4Z18 – Recommendation to the City Council to Adopt Chapter 13.39 Site Specific Development Districts – Residential – Muirhouse (SSD-R Muirhouse) of the Taylorsville Land Development Code. (Mark McGrath – Director of Community Development)  7:45 PM

5.1 **Mr. McGrath** presented this item. He said that Items 5, 6, and 7 all relate to the same property; therefore, he would be giving one presentation for all three. There is the adoption of a new zoning classification that would be specific to this property and project, and also a general plan amendment and a zoning map amendment. Item #5 is the creation of the new SSD-R-Muirhouse District. He displayed an image of the site, stating it is located near the intersection of 4700 South and Bangerter Highway. He showed the general plan map which shows an office use on the subject property and indicated that the existing zoning is for Hospital. Both plans have recommendations proposed to be changed this evening to high density and multi-family residential in both cases. He discussed the proposed project saying that figures from proposed SSD-R Ordinance, which indicate the boundary, so the subject parcel is segregated into several individual properties. The zoning ordinance will be specific to everything except for the parcel in the upper left on the image, labeled as “commercial parcel”. That will not be part of the SSD-R and also the commercial parcel in the lower left will be outside the area as well. He showed the land use table uses that will be allowed or specifically not allowed with a conditional use permit. It is limited and geared directly towards this project. There are a couple included just to indicated that they are specifically not permitted, for example – short term residential and backyard chickens. Shown as permitted uses are residential facility for elderly persons and residential facility for persons with a disability that were included to make sure the City is in compliance with the Fair Housing Act. **Commissioner Quigley** asked if on this development he was saying no one in there can lease out their units or does that refer more to weekend rentals.

5.1.1 **Mr. McGrath** said that was like an Air B&B, so basically renting out for less than 30 days. He showed the floor plans, elevations and design schemes being proposed in the ordinance citing that there a number of different models and variations on the models. The buildings are a combination of efface, stucco and siding. These are all high-quality building materials. He went over the proposed site plan in detail which showed consistency with previously submitted plans. The existing road will be landscaped with a center tree lined median. There is still a park located in the same location as previous submittals had shown, which he felt

would add immensely to the project. Also, being proposed is a small dog park in the southeast corner of the property. There have been slight changes made in order to accommodate the land that UDOT will be taking for the future interchange but generally the whole layout is generally consistent. He reviewed the landscape plans and was satisfied with what is being proposed. He gave a description of what the proposed monument sign would consist of and went over the site lighting plan. He discussed the topography of the site, saying that it is generally flat. He went over the proposed fence design and said that once UDOT comes in and does the new interchange, it was expected that fence on the east side of the project will be upgraded to a masonry fence to be installed by UDOT as part of the interchange improvements. The vinyl coated chain link fence will be around the dog park in order to provide site vision inside the park but at the same time contain the animals. Regarding the entrance sign the proposed height was 8'10" which is almost three feet higher than what is typical for monument sign standards. **Mr. McGrath** said that he has discussed that with the developer separately and they were okay with lowering the height down to 6' tall. There was also a question earlier about building heights and again while talking with the developers they said the 35' height restriction would also work for them. At this point he opened it up for questions from the Commissioners.

5.1.2 **Commissioner Burggraaf** asked a question about the land use table and wanted to know about short term rentals such which would not be permitted but that apparently a bed and breakfast, which would also be short term, would be allowed via administrative conditional use. He felt they were similar except with one there is a host involved. **Mr. McGrath** said that was a good point but felt that no one would probably want to establish a bed and breakfast there but was amenable to making that consistent in making them both not permitted. **Commissioner Burggraaf** wondered if it was a problem to have them there. **Commissioner Warnas** commented that parking might become an issue. **Mr. McGrath** asked if the Commissioners wanted that amended under the bed and breakfast to just make it consistent with the short term residential lease so they are both not permitted. **Commissioner Wendel** felt they were a similar business. **Commissioner Burggraaf** said his intent was to make it consistent but probably would go the other way and say they both should be administrative conditional uses. However, that he would agree with whatever the majority of the Commissioners wanted. **Mr. McGrath** said he had no real concern either way and felt the chance of either one wanting to be proposed there was very low. **Commissioner Peterson** added that the HOA bylaws would probably prohibit those uses anyway. **Commissioner Barbieri** was in favor of making them not being permitted.


5.1.3 **Commissioner Peterson** wanted clarification on the table where it indicates an "S" and **Mr. McGrath** said that was a special permit, with an extra level of regulation thereto, such as accessory units, cell towers, etc. The "S" refers all to Chapter 11. **Commissioner Barbieri** asked about the fence, regarding the east point of their fence to Bangerter and wanted to know who takes care of that property. **Mr. McGrath** said that it will be the responsibility of current property owner until UDOT purchases it, which is proposed to be about ten years out. **Commissioner Barbieri** asked if there was still going to be a sound wall there and **Mr. McGrath** said that was correct, when UDOT constructs the interchange there will be a wall at that location. Therefore, the white vinyl fence would be replaced by a taller masonry wall. **Commissioner Peterson** said that he would like to clarify that being something he deals with in his job and made sure the Commissioners know that is not a "guarantee" that a noise wall would be put there. He felt that it is likely that it would be done but did not want anyone to assume that it was a given. **Mr. McGrath** said that UDOT is usually pretty good to work with in this type of situation where there is a definite noise level. **Commissioner Peterson** said that was correct but their policy says that the property owners who are benefited have a say in whether or not they want the abatement in order to reduce the decibels. Also, with any new project, UDOT does an analysis of the noise level and puts it before the citizens for a vote.  8:01 PM


5.2 Findings:

- 5.2.1 Hamlet Development Corporation has made application to the City of Taylorsville to construct a new 87-unit town home development at 3845 West 4700 South.
- 5.2.2 The subject property is currently zoned Hospital (H). In order to facilitate the development of the proposed multi-family project, the applicant has requested rezoning the property to SSD-R Muirhouse. The SSD-R
- 5.3.3 Muirhouse will be a new zoning classification in the City.
- 5.2.3 Previous to rezoning the property, a companion ordinance must be adopted to provide specific development standards for the new SSD-R Muirhouse classification.
- 5.2.4 The attached development standards shown in Exhibit A – (on file) are based on the provisions of Chapter 13.19 Site Specific Development (SSD) Districts of the Taylorsville Municipal Code.
- 5.2.5 The proposed development standards articulated in Exhibit A will guide future development at the subject site by identifying standards for land use and density, architectural design, site planning, site furnishings, grading and drainage, vehicular circulation and parking, pedestrian mobility and circulation, screen walls and fences, signage, and exterior lighting.

5.2.6 All current development standards and regulations within the Taylorsville Land Development Code shall apply in the SSD-R Muirhouse classification to all matters not specifically addressed in Exhibit A.

5.3 **Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the proposed changes.

5.4 **Applicant:** **Mike Brodsky**  8:03 PM was present to answer questions. He advised that some of the Commissioners were present at the work session regarding this project. He addressed the first point regarding the bed and breakfast and short-term rentals by saying that the CCNR's will restrict short term rentals to at least a 12-month period. There will be a prohibition on any type of short term rentals. Anyone wanting to rent their home must notify the HOA and provide copies of the lease for approval. Regarding the acquisition of the property by UDOT, it will occur almost immediately. He intends, provided that the City gives their approval, to move forward. They expect to purchase the property at the end of May and within a week or two UDOT has indicated they will acquire the additional area they want from the applicant at that point. Therefore, UDOT will be in possession of that property almost immediately. He pointed out that as the design has progressed with the parking along the eastern edge, the distance right now from the closest house to the existing Bangerter Highway property line is about 120 feet. Once the UDOT parcel has been acquired still is about 65 feet. At one point they had considered putting up a masonry wall along that right of way but concluded that because it would be torn down, the fact that the homes would be pre-existing to the improvements on Bangerter Highway, they knew that a sound wall would be built there and thought it was not prudent to put in the masonry wall short term. He passed out hard copies of some of the details discussed during Staff's presentation and handed them out to the Commissioners. He then added that other than the notes he had made during the work session on the 13th, that was all the comments he had tonight.

5.4.1 **Commissioner Quigley** asked about the canal and said he was confused on the bordering of that and wanted to know if the canal was on Mr. Brodsky's property line. **Mr. Brodsky** advised the canal was inside their property line. **Commissioner Quigley** asked if that were by easement and **Mr. Brodsky** said that they were fencing it outside because there is a canal maintenance road. **Commissioner Quigley** then wanted to know where the fence would then go, east or west side of the canal. **Mr. Brodsky** said it was on the northeast side of the canal and would be a vinyl type fence. **Commissioner Quigley** expressed concern about that because the access down the canal apparently would still be available through the dirt road and wanted to know if at a minimum there would be a gate across there. **Mr. Brodsky** said they would have access down that road for canal maintenance. **Commissioner Quigley** then commented that on the other side of the canal it is residential and felt a white vinyl fence would invite graffiti and create problems for the home owners having to deal with upkeep of that from their side. His point was that maybe a vinyl fence was not the best product there because most of it is for the dog park and open community and suggested a chain link vinyl covered type fence there instead to make it spray proof for graffiti vandalism. **Mr. Brodsky** said that he did not disagree with that statement but added that the responsibility of maintaining that fence and keeping it clean lies with the Home Owner's Association.  8:06 PM He felt this is a subjective evaluation with each City they do projects in. That they have discussed the type of fence that would work best here with Mr. McGrath and the conclusion was that the vinyl fence would be the best choice. However, this does place the burden on the Home Owner's Association because they are responsible for maintenance. **Commissioner Quigley** indicated his comments are coming from a property management standpoint and still felt the vinyl fence would invite vandalism and would be more supportive of the chain link fence. He asked **Mr. Brodsky** what type of impact that would have on the overall presentation of the community. **Mr. Brodsky** said that his preference was the black vinyl chain link fence but he was present to listen to comments and recommendations tonight and make the decision that will work best.

5.4.2 **Commissioner Wendel** interjected that this comes down to a subjective standpoint, with pros and cons on both sides. **Commissioner Warnas** added that his concern was security and if there is visibility through the fence he felt it would be better. **Commissioner Burggraaf** said that chain link cheapens the look of the project and supported going that route and letting the Home Owner's Association deal with it. However, that he would be willing to support whatever the majority of Commissioners want. **Mr. McGrath** offered that Staff is trying to resolve all issues this evening because this proposal will not be coming back to the Commission after the City Council does their review. He added that as far as fencing is concerned, masonry is the biggest target and vinyl to a lesser degree. With regard to this particular area, the maintenance road would be used very little and did not feel that would be too much of a target for vandalism, however, whatever the choice is, the main focus should be on security. **Commissioner Barbieri** indicated her choice would be the vinyl. **Commissioner Wendel** agreed security is of the utmost importance and suggested adding additional landscaping along the fence if the choice is chain link. **Commissioner Peterson** felt it would be a shame to have a solid fence along this area and supported the open look fencing with dense shrubbery instead. **Mr. Brodsky** said there would be a solid vinyl fence in all other areas and chain link along the canal. The north side abuts against the IHC property and is not really a thoroughfare. The access along Bangerter Highway is also somewhat limited. **Commissioner Barbieri** said she would support whatever Mr. Brodsky decides would be best for his community. She supported the white vinyl but if the other Commissioners feel strongly about the canal area, she was in favor of going with the best choice for safety there. **Commissioner Quigley** said he has 30 years in background in commercial property management and felt that that

masonry was not more permeable than vinyl. There would be a major problem with graffiti, which is being suggested as being the home owner's responsibility but felt that the City would need to get involved, especially through Code Enforcement. It is out of sight on the other side of the fence and the HOA is not going to know it is there. The people living on the other side of the canal will know and therein lies the problem. He was supportive of the vinyl fencing in that area.

5.4.3 **Commissioner Wendel** said what she was hearing from both sides is the concern about creating the beautiful development and using high quality products, with aesthetics being critically important, so white vinyl fencing is the standard. She also was hearing that there is something about chain link, with the exception of a dog park, that seems to cheapen an area. She wanted to find a way to add to the area to cover multiple needs: What is going to be semi-permeable or see through in some sense that would allow for the security aspect to be covered and what is going to rise to the occasion of what the community is stating. Has there been anything done or potentially could be done in additional landscaping with shrubbery or flowers that would offset the lesser idea of a chain link fence or the idea of other vinyl products that allow slats or vision to be considered here. **Commissioner Peterson** indicated that there are planned trees and shrubs already being proposed along that fence line. If it were a black vinyl fence, over time it would not be visible because of the plantings there. He added that considering that this is a wide-open space area, it would be a shame to enclose it a solid fence. His other suggestion if they did not go with the chain link would be a vinyl fence that has slots to allow visibility.

5.4.4 **Mr. Brodsky** asked the Commissioners to look at the landscape plan and note that there is a substantial number of plantings being proposed already which are a combination of evergreens and deciduous trees, which over time fill in nicely and will obscure the chain link fence. He felt that would be much more attractive and would deal with the graffiti issue. **Commissioner Barbieri** agreed with those comments and liked the looks of that proposal. **Commissioner Burggraaf** said if that is what Mr. Brodsky wants for his product that resolves the issue for him. **Commissioner Peterson** added as a visual perspective of the property owners across the canal, as the vegetation grows in the black chain link fence will blend in with the vegetation, therefore he was supportive of the black vinyl fence there. **Commissioner Wendel** said her only concern was with it being six feet high, which would be tough to camouflage, especially early on, therefore, she would encourage the applicant to plant that area with a nice variation of heights. **Mr. Brodsky** added that the evergreens especially create a very nice visual barrier and if it is acceptable to the Planning Commission he agreed to double the number of evergreen trees presently shown on the plan. **Commissioner Barbieri** said that was great and the Commission will approve the black vinyl fence if the number of trees is doubled. **Mr. Brodsky** said that he said agreed to double the number of evergreen trees because the deciduous trees would not create any visual barrier for half of the year due to shedding their leaves.

5.4.5 **Mr. McGrath** reiterated that the real benefit of the black or dark green vinyl chain link fence is that they tend to disappear when looking at them from a distance. **Commissioner Wendel** asked exactly how many evergreens would be involved then. **Mr. Brodsky** said there is presently eleven, so it would mean an additional eleven or twenty-two total. **Mr. McGrath** advised Mr. Brodsky to have his landscape architect design some view corridors through there. **Mr. Brodsky** said that is exactly how it is currently; the trees are not in a straight row but staggered back forth and that would be continued with the additional trees being included.

5.4.6 **Commissioner Quigley** asked for discussion regarding the height of the monument sign and buildings. **Commissioner Wendel** said that the applicant has agreed to cap the sign at 6' high and the buildings at 35'.

5.5 **Speaking:** **Commissioner Wendel** opened the public hearing and since no one came forward, closed the public hearing and opened the meeting for discussion amongst the Commissioners. **Commissioner Warnas** thanked the representatives from Hamlet Homes for going above and beyond in trying to make this project work.


5.6 **DISCUSSION:** **Mr. McGrath** asked for clarification on the fencing. The property as it borders the canal will be 6' high colored vinyl chain link fence. All other perimeter fencing is still the solid vinyl fence. **Commissioner Barbieri** added that the applicant said that he was contemplating going with a masonry wall originally along Bangerter Highway and decided not to because UDOT would be putting in a sound wall there instead.

5.7 **MOTION:** **Commissioner Barbieri** - I will make a motion. I recommend that we approve File #4Z18 to include residential in the site-specific development district. We must make sure that we change that the monument sign will be 6' high and with a maximum height of 35' homes. **Commissioner Wendel** repeated the motion: We have a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt Chapter 13.39, Site Specific Development District – Residential – Muirhouse SSD-R of the Taylorsville Land Development Code, including the change to the monument sign not exceed 6' and building heights at 35'. **Mr. McGrath** – does that include the changes to the fencing? **Commissioner Wendel** – Yes, also adding that the fencing requirements as discussed be included along with the total amount of 22 evergreens in the proposed landscaping.
SECOND: **Commissioner Warnas**

VOTE: [Commissioner Peterson](#) – AYE, [Commissioner Barbieri](#) – AYE, [Commissioner Quigley](#) – AYE, [Commissioner Warnas](#) – AYE, [Commissioner Burggraaf](#) – AYE.



8:36 PM

6. 2G17 – Recommendation to the City Council for a General Plan Amendment from Professional Office to High Density Residential. (Amanda Roman/Associate Planner)  8:37 PM

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

6.1 **Mr. McGrath** presented this item. Hamlet Development Corporation has requested consideration for a General Plan amendment for approximately 7.84 acres of real property at 3845 West 4700 South. They are seeking to facilitate a Zoning Map amendment that would permit the construction of high density multi-family housing on 7.84 acres. The current zoning is Hospital (H), the applicant is requesting a Zoning Map amendment to a new designation, SSD-R Muirhouse. The SSD-R Muirhouse was formed by Staff and the applicant to fit the development needs of this specific site and project. The SSD District designation is provided in order to allow the most efficient and creative development of lands that have unique or unusual characteristics.

Findings:

- 6.2.1 This application was initiated by Hamlet Development Corporation.
- 6.2.2 The current General Plan designates this property as Professional Office.
- 6.2.3 The General Plan amendment, in conjunction with a rezone would allow the Hamlet Development Corporation to utilize the property as a high density multi-family residential development.
- 6.2.4 The applicant is requesting a General Plan amendment to High Density Residential.
- 6.2.5 The applicant is also requesting the property be rezoned to SSD-R Muirhouse to build up to 15 residential units per acre.
- 6.2.6 A General Plan amendment must be approved or denied by the City Council.

6.3 **Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Planning Commission sends a positive recommendation to the City Council based on the Staff Report and Findings.

6.4 **Speaking:** **Commissioner Wendel** opened the public hearing and since no one came forward, closed the public hearing and opened the meeting for discussion amongst the Commissioners or a motion.

6.5 **MOTION:** [Commissioner Warnas](#) - I will make a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for File #2G17, a General Plan amendment from Professional Office to High Density Residential.

SECOND: [Commissioner Barbieri](#).

VOTE: [Commissioner Peterson](#) – AYE, [Commissioner Barbieri](#) – AYE, [Commissioner Quigley](#) – AYE, [Commissioner Warnas](#) – AYE, [Commissioner Burggraaf](#) – AYE.



8:38 PM

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

7. 13Z17 – Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Map Amendment from Hospital (H) to Site Specific Development – Residential – Muirhouse (SSD-R Muirhouse). (Amanda Roman/Associate Planner)



8:39 PM

7.1 **Mr. McGrath** presented this item. The Hamlet Development Corporation has requested consideration of a Zoning Map amendment for approximately 7.84 acres of real property at 3845 West 4700 South. The property is currently vacant land. Approximately .91 acres of the property will be sold to UDOT for the future expansion of Bangerter Highway. The applicant is seeking a Zoning Map amendment to change the zoning of the property from Hospital (H) to Site Specific Development – Residential – Muirhouse (SSD-R-Muirhouse). The SSD zone allows the applicant and Staff to work together to create a zoning ordinance based around a finished site plan that is approved by the Planning Commission. The General Plan designates this property as Professional Office. The applicant has also requested a General Plan amendment from Professional Office to High Density Residential on conjunction with this Zoning Map amendment request.

Findings:

- 7.2.1 This application was initiated by Hamlet Development Corporation.
- 7.2.2 The property is currently zoned Hospital (H), the applicant is requesting a zoning Map amendment to SSD-R-Muirhouse.

- 7.2.3 The Zoning Map amendment, in conjunction with a General Plan amendment (2G17) would allow the Hamlet Development Corporation to utilize the property as a high density multi-family residential development.
- 7.2.4 The applicant intends to develop their property with up to 15 units per acre.
- 7.2.5 A Zoning Map amendment must be approved or denied by the City Council.

7.3 **Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Planning Commission sends a positive recommendation of a zoning Map amendment from Hospital (H) to SSD-R-Muirhouse to the City Council based on the Staff Report and Findings.

7.4 **Speaking:** Commissioner Wendel opened the public hearing and since no one came forward, closed the public hearing and opened the meeting for discussion amongst the Commissioners or a motion.

7.5 **MOTION:** Commissioner Warnas - I will make a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for File #13Z17, a Zoning Map Amendment from Hospital (H) to Site Specific Development – Residential – Muirhouse, at 3845 West 4700 South.

SECOND: Commissioner Peterson.

VOTE: Commissioner Peterson – AYE, Commissioner Barbieri – AYE, Commissioner Quigley – AYE, Commissioner Warnas – AYE, Commissioner Burggraaf – AYE.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION: Commissioner Warnas outlined what had transpired during the City Council meeting held on April 4, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of Commissioner Peterson, the meeting was adjourned at 8:44 P.M.



8:44 PM

Respectfully Submitted by:

Jean Gallegos, Administrative Assistant/Recorder for the
City of Taylorsville Planning Commission.

Minutes approved in meeting held on June 12, 2018